

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)**

*DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE*

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE**  
*September 5, 2001*  
*SeaTac, WA*

### **Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Committee Business.....	1
Community Relations Plan Draft Advice .....	1
Site Tours .....	3
Evaluation of Hanford Public Involvement .....	4
Presentation on Decision-making at Hanford .....	5
Public Involvement in Future Budget Processes .....	6
DOE-ORP Openness Document .....	7
Committee Business and Work Plan.....	8
Handouts .....	9
Attendees.....	9

*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

### **Committee Business**

Amber Waldref, Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC) Chair, opened the meeting and introductions were made. The committee's June meeting summary was approved. Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) asked for comments on the Institutional Control Plan, another draft of which will be issued soon.

Gail McClure, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), announced that the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting tomorrow would convene at 8:30 a.m. instead of 9:00 a.m. due to the availability of Assistant Secretary of Energy Jessie Roberson

### **Community Relations Plan Draft Advice**

Issue Manager Amber Waldref introduced the Community Relations Plan (CRP) Draft Advice for discussion and approval for presentation to the full HAB. A revised version of the CRP had been released since the last committee call. Amber noted that very few committee members attended the calls during which the advice was discussed and revised. She highlighted the most significant issues, including whether to specifically list relevant legal statutes.

### ***Committee discussion***

- A committee member pointed out that in the first three pages of the newly revised CRP there is no mention of the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA).
- Another committee member expressed support for the revised CRP, but wondered how the Tri-Party Agencies viewed item 1. Dennis Faulk, EPA, replied that he interprets the advice to mean that EPA should include more explicit information in its public notices and fact sheets. Joy Turner, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), commented that she interprets the advice to mean that the HAB would like the CRP to include more specific language about MTCA, but she was not clear on what specific language would be needed. Amber responded that this item urges generic values to be included. Another committee member commented that it is important for the public to understand that Washington State laws, such as MTCA, apply to the federal government as well, and that MTCA requires more stringent cleanup than Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).
- Dennis Faulk emphasized that the request to add a reference to MTCA in the CRP would involve the legal departments of the Tri-Party Agencies. He urged the committee to avoid this since legal process would cause a significant delay. He added that the other suggested changes looked fine.
- A committee member expressed support for including MTCA expressly so the legal departments would address the issue, since in everyday practice MTCA appears to be addressed irregularly. He commented that it is the legal obligation of Washington citizens to ensure the law is specified and clearly stated so people understand it and the decision making process.
- Joy Turner explained that Ecology will and does follow MTCA, whether it is specified in the CRP or not.
- The committee discussed approving the advice to keep it timely.
- HAB Chair Todd Martin noted that the HAB charter is no longer an appendix to the CRP. He added that the revised CRP is not more readable than the previous version, and suggested it might be useful to conduct a primer on MTCA for HAB members, since many do not fully understand the law. In addition, he pointed out that language encouraging public attendance at HAB meetings had been removed.
- Dennis Faulk explained that the HAB charter was removed because it changes occasionally. He noted that the CRP still says that DOE is able to fund the HAB. Dennis further suggested the HAB either issue consensus advice, request an extension to the public comment period on the revised CRP, and/or provide individual comments on the CRP to Gail McClure, DOE-RL.
- Mary Ann Wuennecke, Ecology, added that the comment period is 45 days long, from August 17<sup>th</sup> through October 10<sup>th</sup>. However, if all three agencies agree, the public comment period could be extended.
- A committee member expressed concern that the title of the CRP implies putting a “spin” on Hanford information instead of simply providing straightforward factual information.
- The committee amended the CRP advice to recommend incorporation by reference of the HAB charter and its commitments into the CRP. The following language was

added as Number Five to the advice: “The plan should say that the charter of the HAB, as it exists or may be amended, including commitments to funding and the Open Public Meetings Act, is part of the Plan and should be attached as an Appendix.”

- The committee discussed going forward with the advice or spending more time evaluating the revisions on the CRP. Many felt that since the committee had already invested so much effort in the advice, it should be forwarded to the HAB as a perspective of what should be included in the CRP, but not a critique of the existing document.

The committee agreed to discuss the revised CRP in its next committee call, noting that it would be more efficient to have a larger discussion. Amber Waldref was nominated to introduce the advice to the HAB.

### **Site Tours**

Issue Manager Betty Tabbutt introduced the issue of site tours, and specifically that there be a way to evaluate information given on tours. She related that her organization, the League of Women Voters, had taken a tour of the site and filled in the draft survey Betty had created. Based on their responses, they did not learn much about cleanup or why Hanford needs so much cleanup money. She urged other committee members to take the virtual tour on the Hanford website (<http://www.hanford.gov/tours/virtual.cfm>). She has also requested information about tours from DOE-RL, such as whether scripts exist.

Mary Goldie, DOE-RL, explained that some tours are held for private groups with specific interests and that those tour agendas are designed with those interests in mind. In addition, contractors lead tours for the general public and Saturday road tours, for which there is a prepared script. The evaluation process of the tours for the general public includes an evaluation card for the Saturday tours and a full sheet evaluation for other tours. The committee clarified that it is interested in evaluations of both types of tours.

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, commented that DOE-RL would probably be able to incorporate some of the draft survey into its existing evaluation process. Joy Turner, Ecology, said that Ecology occasionally gives tours to people with special interests or requests. She understands that the committee is concerned that a balanced view (from all Tri-Party agencies) is conveyed during the tours.

Committee members expressed the opinion that all tour participants should be informed about cleanup cost issues. Betty Tabbutt added that the virtual tour did not include any information about groundwater plumes moving toward the Columbia River. DOE-RL representatives reported that a groundwater/vadose zone video will be put on the Hanford website shortly and that a link from the virtual tour will be added when ready.

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, pointed out that it is in DOE-RL's best interest to tell the whole cleanup story on tours in order to be fully funded. She acknowledged that the tour script does not focus on health hazards.

### ***Committee Discussion***

- The committee acknowledged that tours are very important, and that regular citizens should be able to understand what Hanford did originally, current cleanup efforts and progress, and why so much money is needed for full cleanup.
- A committee member acknowledged that the Hanford story is very long, and that it would be difficult to achieve continuity on site tours since many different people at various facilities are involved. To achieve continuity, it was suggested that a video be played during the initial 20-minute drive.
- A committee member suggested the committee obtain the tour script, review it, and perhaps put it on the Internet.
- A committee member expressed concern that handouts distributed on tours are primarily public relations pieces and do not provide meaningful information on radiation. A discussion then ensued about the tour guide on that tour, who had made erroneous statements and failed to stop a physical assault. The committee agreed that more training might be necessary for tour guides.
- The committee acknowledged that there are differences in individual people's acknowledgement of risk and the extent of contamination on the site. One example is the recent statement by a senior scientist from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory that no waste had been emitted and there was no contamination to the Columbia River. . It was suggested that committee members go on upcoming tours to provide counter perspectives.

Committee members agreed that it would not be possible to script everything said about Hanford, but that evaluating the scripts and continuing the work on surveys would be useful. Issue Manager Betty Tabbutt also suggested including a regulator on tours to provide another perspective, although she did not know if that was a reasonable request. Dennis Faulk suggested that the committee review the tour script, which mostly provides historical information, and add points where a different perspective would be useful. A committee member added that the committee would also like to review guidelines for the tours.

It was decided that issue managers Betty Tabbutt and Madeleine Brown should work with EnviroIssues to distribute the draft site tour survey to committee members for comments. In addition, it was suggested that the issue managers collect site tour scripts for review by the committee.

### **Evaluation of Hanford Public Involvement**

Issue Manager Bill Kinsella reintroduced this topic and its scope, including: who participates in public involvement; what channels are available and how are those available; who doesn't participate and why not; and is there value in reaching a broader range of people? He described the matrix completed by the Tri-Party Agencies. Bill

noted that since the agencies are developing a product for the December HAB meeting, he aims to create a product by that time – not necessarily advice. He would like the committee to review the matrices prepared by the TPA Agencies

Bill clarified that this effort is to evaluate Hanford Public Involvement. Marla Marvin suggested adding another column to the matrix that would list the HAB's public involvement efforts. A committee member agreed and added that HAB members should do some public involvement.

The committee discussed the timing and end product of this effort. Dennis Faulk expressed a lack of confidence that the TPA Evaluation of Public Involvement would be completed in the next few months. Bill Kinsella suggested that three products from this effort might be a white paper, discussion in the committee, and discussion at the HAB. The white paper could serve as a conversation starter generally and about whether advice should be considered specifically, and could be included in the December packet. The scope of the white paper might include 1) background on the importance of public involvement (explaining that Hanford is a public problem, not just a DOE problem multiple perspectives are needed), 2) what has been done so far and its effectiveness, and 3) what activities are missing or need to be developed?

### **Presentation on Decision-making at Hanford**

A presentation on decision-making was made by Christie Drew, a graduate student in the Department of Geography at the University of Washington and liaison to the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP), made a presentation on Cleanup Transparency at Hanford. Lynn Walshwell, also from CRESP, asked for permission to photograph Christie Drew during the presentation. The committee agreed on condition that before the photograph is used or published, CRESP request and be granted permission from the HAB Executive Committee.

Christie Drew explained that she has been studying risk and risk information as part of her doctorate dissertation. Her dissertation is about the Decision Mapping System (DMS), a demonstration project to show cleanup decisions to interested parties. In order to participate in decision-making, people need to understand the issues, but information is scattered in large numbers of documents that are complex and difficult to read, and there are many complex regulations. The DMS is intended for a broad audience – from people who want to learn the basics to those who want more detail.

The DMS is intended as a way to learn about the where, why, and when of Hanford Cleanup, in particular the 100 Area. Maps are available, and the system describes how cleanup is organized and moves forward, how different environmental regulations are applicable, and what other work has been done and what is planned.

Christie Drew is trying to develop a metric to evaluate the transparency of decisions, including decision accessibility, clarity, integration with other decisions, logic and rationality, accountability, and truth and accuracy. A major goal of her project was to

understand transparency better and develop a pilot system that promotes transparency of Hanford cleanup decisions on the internet, evaluate decisions, and work with stakeholders in all phases of the project. The next major phase of the project is developing the evaluation, hopefully through a survey and a few focus groups.

The benefits of the DMS are that it integrates information from a broad variety of sources and would help use the Internet as a clearinghouse. It is also valuable for recording the spatial, temporal and social dimensions of a decision, airing the cleanup decision process publicly to foster dialogue, and incorporating multiple values and perspectives. If the DMS were fully implemented, it could serve as a lasting institutional control for the site. In addition, it may help direct resources to develop an independent gage/measure for decisions. Christie asked the committee for feedback, and she noted that the site will go live in the next couple weeks; she will send the committee the website address when it is available.

### ***Committee Discussion/Questions***

- Max Power, Ecology, commented that it would be useful for the DMS to become part of the site's Institutional Controls. He felt this effort is the most promising thing he has seen that integrates decisions across time and geography, and could be fairly easily maintained. He hopes CRESP continues working on the project.
- A committee member asked how the social impacts of the decisions were assessed, noting that local community response to vitrification plant varies greatly. Christie Drew answered that the immediate goal is to conduct a survey or evaluation, then determine how the DMS could be implemented, since the project requires a lot of work. It could not go forward without a steering group to decide priorities, which will involve working with DOE and the Tri-Party Agencies.
- Dennis Faulk, EPA, warned that when the institutional memory is gone, it would be difficult to track all of the decisions made about the site. He expressed support for the continuation of the project.
- What would be the maintenance effort for the DMS? Christie Drew acknowledged that a lot of effort would be required, but she believes it would be worthwhile. A committee member commented that ideally the extent of the DMS would shrink as more waste is permanently treated.
- A committee member commented that this project would help DOE obtain the necessary funding as well as provide the information the public needs.

### **Public Involvement in Future Budget Processes**

Issue Manager Gerry Pollet framed this topic, scheduled as an item for the HAB the following day. Members of the PIC committee were sent a work plan with a cover letter from Harold Heacock about a draft proposal for a new process, proposed by DOE, to allow the HAB to discuss baseline scenarios with DOE and the regulators as alternative budget prioritizations are considered.

The document under consideration is a work plan for how the Budgets and Contracts Committee would receive and provide input as budget scenarios develop. In the plan, the committee would seek the approval of the HAB in December for developing alternative baseline scenarios to request that DOE run. The working group would work with DOE on developing the alternatives. Gerry noted that a lot of work has gone into this document, which was created as a work plan from the committee with a lot of support from DOE-RL and DOE-ORP about when information will be available. Anyone interested would be able to participate in the working group. This document is not advice, but since it is a HAB process, HAB endorsement of the approach is necessary.

### ***Committee Discussion/Questions***

- Does “alternatives” mean different funding scenarios and cleanup priority scenarios? Gerry answered affirmatively. A range of priorities could be addressed.
- How many scenarios do you envision, what are the sources of the scenario, and is the cost of this process taking money away from cleanup? Bob Rosselli, DOE-RL, answered that DOE-RL would run “a few” scenarios, to be decided with the input of the regulators and the Budgets and Contracts Committee. The process would not cost much, since the data exists and is just being moved around.
- Will the HAB provide advice about cleanup priorities based on the results of the scenarios? Gerry answered that the standard HAB advice procedures would be followed.
- Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, commented that in the past DOE-RL decided priorities project by project. The baseline process recognizes the interrelation of the various projects, which allows DOE-RL to manipulate scenarios much more easily. It is also more accurate in reflecting how priority decisions are made and show the impact on other parts of the baseline. It is an important budget tool for the near term (next few years).
- Gerry pointed out that the PIC committee might want to consider how to convey the information in baselines to the public, since the information is contained in multiple poster-size rolls of paper. Wade Ballard added that baselines could be summarized in one page, at the highest level through Project Breakdown Summaries (PBS).
- Peter Bengtson, PNNL, commented that the PIC committee should think about when DOE would provide information. Wade Ballard recommended that the HAB consider national events and allow flexibility during the budget process.

### ***Regulator Response***

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, expressed skepticism and would like TPA milestones to be in place. EPA is approaching this process cautiously.
- Max Power, Ecology, commented that for the first time DOE-RL is able to show the outyear impacts of current budget decisions. That information was not easily obtainable under the Integrated Priority List (IPL) process, but the new baseline system may provide implications of the scenarios.

### **DOE-ORP Openness Document**

Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, provided background on this issue. He explained that when the Regulatory Unit joined DOE-ORP it brought an openness plan and subsequently all of DOE-ORP has worked to incorporate it for all of its operations. DOE-ORP has distributed a working draft of the plan and would like comments on its strengths and weaknesses as well as input on how to evaluate openness.

- One committee member congratulated DOE-ORP and commented that this is an important step forward. He also advised a major area to consider was that the openness definition does not include a safety conscious workplace. The final issue he raised relates to the entire CRP – for access to records, you have strong commitments about what records will be available, but Gerry urges access to those or extending the comment period. Overall he thinks there are innovative ideas – manager meetings monthly, etc.
- Does DOE-RL have an Openness Plan? No, it does not. At the committee's suggestion, Marla Marvin, DOE-RL agreed to consider adopting DOE-ORP's plan. She noted that DOE-RL has openness procedures and that DOE-ORP's plan was developed from the Regulatory Unit that originated at DOE-RL.
- A committee member commented that she likes the way that DOE-ORP obtains feedback and responds to comments. She pointed out that it would be good to specify how long the public should expect to hear responses to their comments.
- Committee members will submit comment on the plan to DOE-ORP.
- Joy Turner, Ecology, requested that DOE-ORP inform the full HAB about its openness plan.

### **Committee Business and Work Plan**

The committee adopted its meeting summaries from May and June. The next committee call will be on September 20<sup>th</sup>; the next Executive Issues Management Group call is also on that day. The committee will determine its next meeting on its next committee call. Amber Waldref volunteered to give the committee update at the HAB meeting the next day.

The committee discussed HAB public involvement as a new issue. The committee discussed the apparent paradox of individual HAB members not speaking for the HAB but still doing so. One committee member noted that she is very careful about pointing people instructionally to advice or other sources. Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford, suggested looking at the HAB charter. Issue Manager Bill Kinsella recommended the committee discuss Hanford Update articles, the HAB web page, and other sources of public information earlier in a future committee meeting, not a committee call. As a prelude to that discussion, committee member Ken Niles announced that the Oregon Office of Energy, with assistance from Ecology, had staffed an information booth at the Hood River County Fair in July. They created new information materials fairly inexpensively and borrowed display materials from Ecology and DOE-ORP. Hood River was selected because it is on the Columbia River, the fair was only for four days, and usually around 10,000 people attend. While this year only about 100 contacts were made, he wanted to



give credit to the Columbia Riverkeeper organization because many people had heard of it.

### **Handouts**

- Public Involvement and Communication Committee Draft Meeting Agenda, September 5, 2001
- Public Involvement and Communication Committee Work Planning Table, August 21, 2001
- Hanford Advisory Board Draft Advice, Topic: Community Relations Plan, Version #3, September 5, 2001
- E-mail from Amber Waldref to Susan Wright, forwarding description of Christie Drew's (CRESP) presentation about Hanford Cleanup Decisions, August 13, 2001 (neon yellow)
- Draft Survey about Tours of Hanford Site by Betty Tabbutt for PIC Committee, September 5, 2001 (bright blue)

---

### **Attendees**

#### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Pam Brown	Jim Curdy	Greg deBruler
Norma Jean Germond	Bill Kinsella	Susan Leckband
Todd Martin	Ken Niles	Gerry Pollet
Betty Tabbutt	Jim Trombold	Amber Waldref
Charles Weems		

#### **Others**

Wade Ballard, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Mary Goldie, DOE-RL (phone)	Fred Jamison, Ecology	Christie Drew, CRES & UW
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Lynn Walshwell, CRES
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Joy Turner, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique
Bob Rosselli, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Susan Wright, EnviroIssues
		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
		Ruth Yarrow, Physicians for Social Responsibility
		Fred Tabbutt